arXiv:1112.6185v1 [math-ph] 28 Dec 2011

The semi-classical limit of the time dependent Hartree-Fock equation.

I. The Weyl Symbol of the solution.

L. Amour, M. Khodja et J. Nourrigat

Laboratoire de Mathématiques, EA4535
Université de Reims, U.F.R. Sciences Exactes et Naturelles
Moulin de la Housse - BP 1039, 51687 REIMS Cedex 2, France
and FR.CNRS.3399

1. Introduction.

The time dependent Hartree-Fock (TDHF) describes, when the number N of particules tends to infinity, the time evolution of the density operator of a quantum system of N interacting particules in the mean field approximation, in other words, when the interaction between two particules is of order $1/N$. For this limiting process when $N \to +\infty$, see, for eaxample, the recent works of [AN1], [AN2], [BGGM] , [ES], [FKS],....

A solution to this equation (TDHF) is a density operator $\rho_h(t)$, that is to say a trace class operator in $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (if each of the particules in interaction is moving in $\mathbb{R}^n$), selfadjoint, ≥ 0, of trace equal to 1, evolving as a function of t, and depending on a semiclassical parameter h tending to 0.

The aim of this work is the analysis of such a solution when the parameter h tends to 0. The analysis will, in particular, make precise the relationship to the Vlasov equation. To establish this relationship, we may associate to the operator $\rho_h(t)$ two notions of symbols: the Weyl symbol (studied in this paper), and the Wick symbol (studied in a second paper). The Weyl symbol may only be used under rather strong hypotheses on the operator $\rho_h(0)$, hypotheses that will be weakened in the second part. In the two articles, the convergence of different symbols when $h \to 0$ will be a convergence in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$.

Since (TDHF) appears as a limiting process when the number of particules N de particules tend to infinity, a natural question is the one of the interchange of the two limits, the one where N tends to infinity, and the one where the semiclassical parameter h tends vers 0. It is the subject of the article [PP] of F. Pezzotti and M. Pulvirenti, where it is shown that the Weyl symbol of the marginal density operator associated to a particule in a system of N particules, admits an asymptotic expansion in powers of h, and that the Weyl symbol tends towards the symbol of a solution of (TDHF), and that the coefficient of h^j in the asymptotic expansion of the symbol admits a limit when N tends to infinity , and that for $j = 0$, this limit is a solution of the Vlasov equation. We observe that in [PP] les limits are in the sense of $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, while in this work and in the second part they are in the sense of $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. See also [P] and [GMP].

The two equations (TDHF and Vlasov) describe the time evolution of particle density, the first one in quantum mechanics, and the second one in classical mechanics. Both are dependent on two potentials V et W. The first one, V, is the external potential to which all particles are submitted, while W is the mutual interaction potential. In this work, these two functions V and W will be real valued C^∞ functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$, assumed to be bounded as well as all their derivatives. Let us state precisely now these two equations.

In classical mechanics, the density at time t is a function $v(x, \xi, t) \geq 0$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, whose integral equals 1. The classical average potential at the point x associated to the density $v(., t)$ is

$$V_{cl}(x, v(., t)) = V(x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} W(x - y) v(y, \eta, t) dy d\eta. \tag{1.1}$$

The function v verifies the Vlasov equation:

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t}+2\sum_{j=1}^{n}\xi_j\frac{\partial v}{\partial x_j}-\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\partial V_{cl}(x,v(.,t))}{\partial x_j}\frac{\partial v}{\partial \xi_j}=0. \tag{1.2}$$

If, at an initial time, the data $v(.,0)$ is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, and if it is ≥ 0, these two properties remain true for all $t\in\mathbb{R}$, and the integral $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ de $v(.,t)$ is conserved. (see Braun-Hepp [BH]).

In quantum mechanics, the density at time t is described by a family of self adjoint trace class operators $\rho_h(t)\geq 0$ $(h>0)$ on $\mathcal{H}=L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, with trace equals to 1. The average quantum potential at the point x, associated to the density operator $\rho_h(t)$, is:

$$V_q(x,\rho_h(t))=V(x)+Tr(W_x\rho_h(t)), \tag{1.3}$$

where W_x is the multiplication operator by the function $y\to W(x-y)$. We will denote by $V_q(\rho_h(t))$ the multiplication operator by the function $x\to V_q(x,\rho_h(t))$. The density operator $\rho_h(t)$ is trace class, self adjoint, ≥ 0, and verifies the (TDHF) equation :

$$ih\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho_h(t)=-h^2[\Delta,\rho_h(t)]+[V_q(\rho_h(t)),\rho_h(t)], \tag{1.4}$$

where Δ is the Laplacian. To make precise the meaning given to the commutators, let us recall the notion of classical solution (TDHF) introduced by Bove da Prato Fano ([BdPF1], [BdPF2]). Let us denote by $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})$ the space of trace class operators $\mathcal{H}=L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Denote by $\mathcal{D}$ the space of operators A in $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})$ such that the following limit

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\frac{e^{it\Delta}Ae^{-it\Delta}-A}{t}$$

exists in $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})$. This limit is denoted by $i[\Delta,A]$. A classical solution of (TDHF) (for a fixed $h>0$) is a map $t\to\rho_h(t)$ in $C^1(\mathbb{R},\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})\bigcap C(\mathbb{R},\mathcal{D})$ verifying (1.4). In [BdPF1] and [BdPF2], it is shown that if $\rho_h(t)$ is a classical solution of (TDHF) and if the operator $\rho_h(0)$ is ≥ 0, then for all $t\in\mathbb{R}$, one has $\rho_h(t)\geq 0$ for all t, and the trace of $\rho_h(t)$ is constant.

Our first aim is to understand the Weyl symbol of $\rho_h(t)$, whose definition is recalled in section 2. The Weyl calculus establishes a bijection, that depends on a parameter $h>0$, between tempered distributions on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ (called symbols), and the continous operators of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For every tempered distribution F on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, and for every $h>0$, let $Op_h^{weyl}(F)$ be the associated Weyl operator (see section 2). For every continous operator A of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and, for every $h>0$, let $\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)$ be the Weyl symbol of A. Hence, the equalities $F=\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)$ and $A=Op_h^{weyl}(F)$ are equivalent.

This work uses results of C. Rondeaux [R], that studies the Weyl symbols of operators in the Schatten classes, and in particular of trace class operators. We will denote by $W^{m,p}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ $(1\leq p\leq\infty)$ the space of functions that belong to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, as well as all their derivatives of order $\leq m$. It is proved in C. Rondeaux [R] that every function in $W^{2n+2,1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ is the Weyl symbol of a trace class operator. One can find in [R] a characterization of trace class operators whose Weyl symbol is in $W^{\infty,1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. It is also shown in [R] that a trace class operator A enjoys this propriety if and only if its iterated commutators with the following operators

$$P_j(h)=\frac{h}{i}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\qquad\qquad Q_j(h)=x_j \tag{1.5}$$

are trace class operators in $\mathcal{H}=L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. This characterization is the analogue of the one given by Beals [B] for bounded operators with their Weyl symbol in $W^{\infty,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. One may find in [R] examples of trace class operators whose Weyl 's symbol is not in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, or of functions in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ that are not the Weyl symbol of a trace class operator. (The first example will be given in a more explicit form in the second part of this work.) These results will be recalled in section 2, by making clear the dependance on the parameter h in view of semi-classical applications, more particularly in the proposition 2.1.

Our first main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(\rho_h(t))_{(h>0)}$ be a family of classical solutions of (TDHF), with V and W in $W^{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We assume that, for every $h>0$, the operator $\rho_h(0)$ is self adjoint ≥ 0, and that its trace equals 1, that, for every $h>0$, its Weyl symbol $\sigma_h^{weyl}(\rho_h(0))$ is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, and that the family of functions*

$$F_h = (2\pi h)^{-n} \sigma_h^{weyl}(\rho_h(0)) \tag{1.6}$$

is bounded in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ independently of h in $(0,1]$. Then, for every $t\in\mathbb{R}$, the Weyl symbol of the operator $\rho_h(t)$ is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, and the family of functions $u_h(.,t)$ defined by:

$$u_h(.,t) = (2\pi h)^{-n} \sigma_h^{weyl}(\rho_h(t)) \tag{1.7}$$

is bounded in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ independently of h in $(0,1]$ and of t in a compact set of $\mathbb{R}$.

The hypothesis of positivity of $\rho_h(0)$ serves to ensure that the trace norm of $\rho_h(t)$ remains constant. Without this hypothesis it is the trace that stays constant, and not the trace norm. This hypothesis is verified if $\rho_h(0) = (2\pi h)^n Op_h^{AW}(G)$, with $G\geq 0$ in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, where $Op_h^{AW}(G)$ is the anti-Wick operator associated to G (see section 2). One finds in Bove da Prato Fano [BdPF1] and [BdPF2] the proof of the fact that, if $\rho_h(0)\geq 0$, then $\rho_h(t)\geq 0$ for every t. Observe that the positivity hypothesis concerns the operator and not the symbol.

It is therefore natural to give an asymptotic expansion in terms of powers of h, of the function $u_h(.,t)$ of (1.7). The first term will be a solution of the Vlasov equation and the rest will be estimated in the L^1 norm. One can see in A. Domps, P. L'Eplattenier, P.G. Reinhard et E. Suraud [DLERS] a physical formulation of this problem. The successive terms depend on the initial data (1.6). If the data depends on h, without possessing an asympotic expansion as powers of h, it is inevitable that the successive terms in the expansion de $u_h(.,t)$ depend on h.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(\rho_h(t)$ be a classical solution of (TDHF) verifying the hypotheses of theorem 1.1. Then there exists a sequence of functions $(X,t)\to u_j(X,t,h)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}\times\mathbb{R}$ $(j\geq 0)$, depending on the parameter $h>0$, such that*

- The function $t\to u_j(.,t,h)$ is C^∞ on $\mathbb{R}$ valued in $W^{\infty,1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. For every multi-index (α,β), there exists a function $C_{\alpha\beta}(t)$, bounded on every compact set of $\mathbb{R}$, such that:

$$\|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta u_j(.,t,h)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C_{\alpha\beta}(t) \tag{1.8}$$

for all $t\in\mathbb{R}$ and $h\in(0,1]$.

- One has, if F_h is the function defined in (1.6):

$$u_0(X,0,h) = F_h(X) \qquad\qquad u_j(X,0,h)=0. \quad (j\geq 1) \tag{1.9}$$

- The function $u_0(X,t,h)$ verifies the Vlasov equation:

$$\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial t} + 2\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial x_j} = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} V_{cl}(u_0(.,t))\ \frac{\partial u_0(.,t)}{\partial \xi_j}. \tag{1.10}$$

- For every $N\geq 1$, the function $u_h(.,t)$ defined in (1.7) and the function $F^{(N)}(.,t,h)$ defined by:

$$F^{(N)}(X,t,h) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} h^j u_j(X,t,h) \tag{1.11}$$

verify if $h \in (0,1]$:

$$\|u_h(.,t) - F^{(N)}(.,t,h)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C_N(t) h^N, \tag{1.12}$$

where C_N is a function on $\mathbb{R}$, bounded on the compact sets.
-For every $N \geq 1$, the operator $\rho_h^{(N)}(t)$ defined by:

$$\rho_h^{(N)}(t) = (2\pi h)^n \ Op_h^{weyl}(F^{(N)}(.,t,h)), \tag{1.13}$$

(where $F^{(N)}(.,t,h)$ is the function of (1.11)), verifies:

$$\|\rho_h(t) - \rho_h^{(N)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq C(t) h^{N+1}. \tag{1.14}$$

In section 5, we will make precise the construction of the u_j ($j \geq 1$), and we will prove the theorem.

In the absence of mutual interaction ($W = 0$), and if one studies the time evolution of bounded operators instead of trace class operators, the time evolution of the Weyl symbol is described by the Egorov theorem (see [H], [R1], [BR]).

If one only makes the hypothesis that $\rho_h(0)$ is trace class, the Weyl symbol of $\rho_h(0)$ is well defined, but is not necessarily in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, which is the natural class to compare with a solution of the Vlasov equation A counterexample is outlined in [R] and will be detailled in the second part of this work. If one wants to strongly weaken the hypotheses on the initial data $\rho_h(0)$, the Weyl calculus is not anymore the right setting to establish a link with the Vlasov equation. On the other hand, we will see in a second part of this work that, under much weaker hypotheses than the ones of theorems 1.1 and 1.2, the Wick symbol of the solution can be used for the relationship between the two equations (TDHF) and Vlasov.

In section 2, we will recall the results of C. Rondeaux [R] by making precise the dependance on the parameter h in view of applications to semi classical analysis. The corresponding results on the composition of symbols and the Moyal bracket are stated in section 3. The results of sections 2 et 3 are proved in the appendixes A et B. For section 2 and appendix A we use a technique of A. Unterberger [U1] and [U2]. The sections 4 et 5 are dedicated to the proofs of theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

2. Weyl calculus and trace class operators.

We denote by $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and by $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})$ the set of trace class operators in $\mathcal{H}$. This space is a normed space with the norm defined by :

$$\|A\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} = Tr\Big((A^\star A)^{1/2}\Big). \tag{2.1}$$

We will denote by $W^{m,p}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ ($1 \leq p \leq +\infty$, m integer ≥ 0 or $m = +\infty$) the space of functions F which are in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, as well as all their derivatives up to order m.

Weyl calculus sets a bijection between the operators A of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$, thus admitting a distribution kernel in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, and tempered distributions on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ (symbols). This bijection may depend on a parameter $h > 0$. For every F in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, we set $Op_h^{weyl}(F)$ the operator $A : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n) \to \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ whose distribution kernel is:

$$K_A(x,y) = (2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} F(\frac{x+y}{2}, \xi) e^{\frac{i}{h}(x-y).\xi} d\xi. \tag{2.2}$$

This relationship, understood in the sense of distributions, may be inverted. We will denote $\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)$ the distribution F (symbol of Weyl of A) such that $A = Op_h^{weyl}(F)$. In view of applications to trace class operators we can rewrite (2.2) equivalently when F is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ as:

$$Op_h^{weyl}(F) = (\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} F(X)\Sigma_{Xh} dX, \tag{2.3}$$

where, for $X = (x, \xi)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, Σ_{Xh} is the "symmetry" operator defined by:

$$(\Sigma_{Xh} f)(u) = e^{\frac{2i}{h}(u-x)\xi} f(2x-u) \qquad X = (x,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}. \tag{2.4}$$

If A is trace class, one has

$$\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)(X) = 2^n Tr(A \circ \Sigma_{Xh}) \qquad X \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}. \tag{2.5}$$

According to Calderon-Vaillancourt [CV] (see also Hörmander [H]) if F is in $W^{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, then $Op_h^{weyl}(F)$ is bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$. If F is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ the operator $Op_h^{weyl}(F)$ is bounded by (2.3) but not necessarily trace class. It is shown in C.Rondeaux [R] that, if F is in $W^{m,p}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, ($1 \leq p < \infty$, m large enough), the operator $Op_h^{weyl}(F)$ is in the Schatten class $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{H})$. For $p = 1$, we will precisely state this in proposition 2.1. If F is in $W^{\infty,1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, one has:

$$Tr(Op_h^{weyl}(F) = (2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} F(X) dX. \tag{2.6}$$

If F is in $W^{\infty p}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and G in $W^{\infty q}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ ($p \geq 1$, $q \geq 1$, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$), one has

$$Tr\Big(Op_h^{weyl}(F) \circ Op_h^{weyl}(G)\Big) = (2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} F(X)G(X) dX. \tag{2.7}$$

The left hand side makes sense, since from [R], the two operators under composition are respectively $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{L}^q(\mathcal{H})$, in such a way that their composition is trace class.

The next proposition mainly due to C. Rondeaux [R], gives sufficient conditions (on the Weyl symbol) for an operator to be trace class, and gives a characterization of the set of operators whose Weyl symbol is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. This characterization is the analogue of the Beals characterization [B], which concerns the symbols in $W^{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$.
We note $P_j(h) = \frac{h}{i}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ the momentum operators and we note $Q_j(h)$ the multiplication by x_j.
For every operator A of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we set

$$(ad\ P(h))^\alpha (ad\ Q(h))^\beta A = (ad\ P_1(h))^{\alpha_1} ... (ad\ Q_n(h))^{\beta_n} A. \tag{2.8}$$

Proposition 2.1. *a) If F is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ as well as all its derivatives up to order $2n+2$, then, for all $h > 0$, the operator $Op_h^{weyl}(F)$ is trace class, and:*

$$\|Op_h^{weyl}(F)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq C h^{-n} \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq 2n+2} h^{(|\alpha|+|\beta|)/2} \|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta F\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}. \tag{2.9}$$

b) If A is a trace class operator, and if, for every multi-index (α, β) such that $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq 2n+2$, the operator $(ad\ P(h))^\alpha (ad\ Q(h))^\beta A$ is trace class, then the Weyl symbol of A is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and:

$$(2\pi h)^{-n} \|\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq 2n+2} h^{-(|\alpha|+|\beta|)/2} \|(ad\ P(h))^\alpha (ad\ Q(h))^\beta A\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})}, \tag{2.10}$$

where the constant C depends only on n.

c) the following are equivalent :

i) A family of operators $(A_h)_{0<h\leq 1}$ is of the form $A_h = Op_h^{weyl}(F_h)$, where (F_h) is a bounded family of functions in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$.

ii) For every $h > 0$, the operator A_h is trace class , as well as all iterated commutators of A_h with the operators $P_j(h)$ and $Q_j(h)$ and , for every (α, β), the family of norms

$$h^{n-|\alpha|-|\beta|} \ \|(ad\ P(h))^{\alpha}(ad\ Q(h))^{\beta} A\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \tag{2.11}$$

stays bounded when h varies in $(0, 1]$.

Parts a) and b) are proved in C. Rondeaux [R], without the parameter h. Part a) needs only minor modifications to introduce this parameter but it seems to us better to give a proof of Part b) in appendix A. For the sake of clarity it might be useful to recall the well-known analogue of proposition 2.1 for the bounded operators and the symbols in $W^{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, that is to say, the Calderon-Vaillancourt theorem and the Beals characterization.

Proposition 2.2. *a) If F is in $L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ as well as all derivatives up to order $2n+2$, then, for all $h > 0$, the operator $Op_h^{weyl}(F)$ is bounded in $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and:*

$$\|Op_h^{weyl}(F)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq 2n+2} h^{(|\alpha|+|\beta|)/2} \|\partial_x^{\alpha}\partial_{\xi}^{\beta} F\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}. \tag{2.12}$$

b) If A is a bounded operator and if, for all multi-indices (α, β) such that $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq 2n + 2$, the operator $(ad\ P(h))^{\alpha}(ad\ Q(h))^{\beta} A$ is bounded, then the Weyl symbol of A is in $L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, and one has:

$$\|\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)\|_{L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq 2n+2} h^{-(|\alpha|+|\beta|)/2} \|(ad\ P(h))^{\alpha}(ad\ Q(h))^{\beta} A\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})}. \tag{2.13}$$

Anti-Wick calculus. The definition of this calculus uses coherent states. By this we mean the family of functions Ψ_{Xh} in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, indexed by the parameter $X = (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, and depending on $h > 0$, defined by

$$\Psi_{X,h}(u) = (\pi h)^{-n/4} e^{-\frac{|u-x|^2}{2h}} e^{\frac{i}{h}u.\xi - \frac{i}{2h}x.\xi} \qquad X = (x, \xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}. \tag{2.14}$$

These functions, called coherent states, will be used to give examples of operators verifying the hypotheses of theorem 1.1, and will be also helpful to prove Proposition 2.1 (appendix A). Fore more properties of the coherent states and the anti-Wick calculus, see, for instance [CF], [F], [CR1], [L1], [R1], [U1], [U2]. The two fundamental properties are the fact that:

$$| < \Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} > | = e^{-\frac{1}{4h}|X-Y|^2} \qquad \|\Psi_{Xh}\| = 1, \tag{2.15}$$

and that, for all f and g in $\mathcal{H}$

$$< f, g >= (2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} < f, \Psi_{Xh} >< \Psi_{Xh}, g > \ dX. \tag{2.16}$$

For every function F in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and for every $h > 0$ we set $Op_h^{AW}(F)$ to be the bounded operator in $L^2(R^n)$ such that for all f and g in $\mathcal{H}$:

$$< Op_h^{AW}(F) f, g >= (2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} a(X) < f, \Psi_{Xh} >< \Psi_{Xh}, g > \ dX. \tag{2.17}$$

If F is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ we see that $Op_h^{AW}(F)$ is indeed trace class in $\mathcal{H}$, and that:

$$\|Op_h^{AW}(F)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq (2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} |F(X)| dX. \tag{2.18}$$

Moreover one has:

$$Tr(Op_h^{AW}(F)) = (2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} F(X) dX. \tag{2.19}$$

If $F \geq 0$, the operator $Op_h^{AW}(F)$ is self adjoint and ≥ 0. The Weyl symbol of the operator $Op_h^{AW}(F)$ is given by :

$$\sigma_h^{weyl}\Big(Op_h^{AW}(F)\Big) = e^{\frac{h}{4}\Delta} F, \tag{2.20}$$

where Δ is the Laplacian on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$. In fact, the operators Σ_{Yh} defined in (2.4) and the operator P_{Xh} of orthogonal projection on $\mathrm{Vect}(\Psi_{Xh})$ verify:

$$Tr(P_{Xh}\Sigma_{Yh}) = e^{-\frac{|X-Y|^2}{h}}. \tag{2.21}$$

3. Basic Facts on the Moyal bracket.

The composition of symbols in the Weyl calculus is a very classical field (see Hörmander [H] or D. Robert [R1] for the dependance on the semiclassical parameter h). We need to adapt this to the classes of C. Rondeaux symbols, by making precise the dependance on the parameter h.

We define a differential operator $\sigma(\nabla_1, \nabla_2)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ by:

$$\sigma(\nabla_1, \nabla_2) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_j \partial \xi_j} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_j \partial \eta_j}, \tag{3.1}$$

where (x, ξ, y, η) denotes the variable of $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}$.

Theorem 3.1. *For all functions F in $W^{\infty p}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and G in $W^{\infty q}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, ($p \geq 1$, $q \geq 1$, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$), for all $h > 0$, there exists a function $M_h(F, G, .)$ in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ (Moyal bracket) such that:*

$$\Big[Op_h^{weyl}(F), Op_h^{weyl}(G)\Big] = Op_h^{weyl}(M_h(F, G, .)). \tag{3.2}$$

For all integers $N \geq 2$, one has:

$$M_h(F, G, X) = \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} h^k C_k(F, G, X) + R_h^{(N)}(F, G, X), \tag{3.3}$$

where the function $C_k(F, G, X)$ is defined by:

$$C_k(F, G, X) = \frac{1}{(2i)^k k!}\Big[\sigma(\nabla_1, \nabla_2)^k (F \otimes G)(X, X) - \sigma(\nabla_1, \nabla_2)^k (G \otimes F)(X, X)\Big], \tag{3.4}$$

and where the function $R_h^{(N)}(F, G, .)$ is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. We can write also (3.3) for $N = 1$, with the convention that the sum vanishes, and that $R_h^{(N)} = M_h$. For every integer ℓ, there exists a constant C such that:

$$h^{\ell/2} \|\nabla^\ell R_h^{(N)}(F, G, .)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq \ell+4n+2+2N \\ |\alpha| \geq N, |\beta| \geq N}} h^{(\alpha+\beta)/2} \|\nabla^\alpha F\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \, \|\nabla^\beta G\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}. \tag{3.5}$$

The operator $\widehat{R}_h^{(N)}(F,G) = Op_h^{weyl}(R_h^{(N)}(F,G,.))$ *verifies:*

$$\|\widehat{R}_h^{(N)}(F,G)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq Ch^{-n} \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq 6n+4+2N \\ |\alpha|\geq N, |\beta|\geq N}} h^{(\alpha+\beta)/2} \|\nabla^\alpha F\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \; \|\nabla^\beta G\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}. \tag{3.6}$$

This theorem will be proved in the appendix B. We will also use in the second part of this work the well known analogue of theorem 3.1, which we recall here in order to allow for its application when needed.

Theorem 3.2. *With the notations of theorem 3.1, if the functions* F *et* G *are in* $W^{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$*, the function* $R_h^{(N)}(F,G,.)$ *defined by the equality () verify, for any* $\ell \geq 0$*:*

$$h^{\ell/2}\|\nabla^\ell R_h^{(N)}(F,G,.)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C \sum_{\substack{j\geq N, k\geq N \\ \ell+2N\leq j+k\leq \ell+2N+4n+2}} h^{(j+k)/2}\|\nabla^j F\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \; \|\nabla^k G\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \tag{3.7}$$

The operator $\widehat{R}_h^{(N)}(F,G)$ *verify:*

$$\|\widehat{R}_h^{(N)}(F,G)\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})} \leq C \sum_{\substack{j\geq N, k\geq N \\ 2N\leq j+k\leq 2N+6n+4}} h^{(j+k)/2}\|\nabla^j F\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \; \|\nabla^k G\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \tag{3.8}$$

4. Egorov's theorem for trace class operators and proof of theorem 1.1.

We are going to adapt to the case of symbols in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and trace class operators the idea of the proof of Egorov's theorem contained in the book of D. Robert [R1]. The difference with [R1] comes from the fact the classes of operators considered here are the classes introduced by C. Rondeaux and that Hamiltonians are time dependent.

We consider a function $(x,t) \to V(x,t)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, real valued, depending in a C^∞ manner on x, and continuously on t. We suppose that, for every α, there exists $C_\alpha > 0$ such that:

$$|\partial_x^\alpha V(x,t)| \leq C_\alpha \qquad (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.1}$$

We set:

$$H(x,\xi,t) = |\xi|^2 + V(x,t). \tag{4.2}$$

We denote by $V(t)$ the multiplication by $V(.,t)$. We set:

$$\widehat{H}_h(t) = -h^2\Delta + V(t). \tag{4.3}$$

Therefore, $\widehat{H}_h(t) = Op_h^{weyl}(H(.,t))$. Let us recall now some facts on unitary propagators ([RS]).

Proposition 4.1. *For all* $t \in \mathbb{R}$*, let* $V(.,t)$ *a* C^∞ *function on* $\mathbb{R}^n$*, verifying (4.1), and depending in a* C^1 *manner on* t*. Let* $\widehat{H}_h(t)$ *be the operator defined in (4.3). For every* f *in* $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$*, and for every* $s \in \mathbb{R}$*, there exists a function denoted by* $t \to U_h(t,s)f$ *that verifies:*

$$ih\frac{\partial}{\partial t}U_h(t,s)f = (\widehat{H}_h(t))U_h(t,s)f, \qquad U_h(s,s)f = f. \tag{4.4}$$

The operator $U_h(t,s)$ *maps* $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *into itself and, by duality,* $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$ *into itself. One has* $U_h(s,t) = U_h(t,s)^{-1}$*. One also has:*

$$ih\frac{\partial}{\partial s}U_h(t,s) = -U_h(t,s)(\widehat{H}_h(s)). \tag{4.5}$$

For every operator A of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ into $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$, let us set:

$$G_h(t,s)(A) = U_h(t,s) \circ A \circ U_h(s,t). \tag{4.6}$$

One has

$$ih\frac{\partial}{\partial t} G_h(t,s)(A) = \Big[\widehat{H}_h(t), G_h(t,s)(A)\Big] \qquad\qquad G_h(s,s)(A) = A. \tag{4.7}$$

The analogue of Egorov's theorem for operators in the class of [R] is the following.

Theorem 4.2. *Let F be a function defined on $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. Let $A_h = Op_h^{weyl}(A)$. Then, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a function F_{ht} in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ such that:*

$$G_h(t,0)(A_h) = Op_h^{weyl}(F_{ht}). \tag{4.8}$$

If the function F and the potential $V(.,t)$ depends on a parameter λ, while staying bounded respectively in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and in $W^{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ independently of λ, (and of t for V), then the function F_{ht} remains bounded in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ independently of λ, of h in $(0,1]$, and of t in a compact set of $\mathbb{R}$.

Following the idea of [R1], which is related in some sense to Dyson's series, we will express our solution $G_h(t,0)(A_h)$ under the form:

$$G_h(t,0)(A_h) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} Op_h^{weyl}\Big(D_k(.,t)\Big) + h^N E_N(t,h), \tag{4.9}$$

where the functions $D_k(.,t)$ are in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and $E_N(t,h)$ will be a trace class operator with bounded trace norm. In a second step, we will show that the commutators of $E_N(t,h)$ with the position and momentum operators are trace class operators, and we will estimate their traces. Finally we will rely on the characterization of C. Rondeaux (recalled in proposition 2.1) to show that $G_h(t,0)(A_h)$ is itself a pseudodifferential operator, with a symbol in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$.

The construction of the terms $D_k(.,t)$ will use the Hamiltonian flow of $H(.,t)$. For every function G in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, we call $\Phi_{ts}(G)$ the function on $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ defined by

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_{t,s}(G)}{\partial t} = \{H(.,t), \Phi_{ts}(G)\}, \qquad\qquad \Phi_{s,s}(G) = G. \tag{4.10}$$

Under hypothese (4.1), one knows that if $G = G_\lambda$ where $(G_\lambda)_{\lambda \in E}$ is a family of bounded functions in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, then $\Phi_{ts}(G_\lambda)$ stays bounded $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ when (t,s) varies in a compact set of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and λ in E.

Lemme 4.3. *For every function G in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and for (t,s) in $\mathbb{R}^2$, one has*

$$G_h(t,s)\Big(OP_h^{weyl}(G)\Big) = Op_h^{weyl}(\Phi_{ts}(G)) + h\int_s^t G_h(t,t_1)\Big(Op_h^{weyl}(R(.,t_1,s,h))\Big)\, dt_1, \tag{4.11}$$

where the function $R(.,t_1,s,h)$ is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. If G belongs to a family of bounded functions in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, it is also the case for $R(.,t_1,s,h)$ when (t_1,s) lies in a compact set of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and h is in $(0,1]$.

Proof of the lemma. From definition (4.10):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} Op_h^{weyl}(\Phi_{ts}(G)) = Op_h^{weyl}(\{H(.,t), \Phi_{ts}(G)\}).$$

With the notations of theorem 3.1, with $N = 2$, one may write:

$$[\widehat{H}_h(t), Op_h^{weyl}(\Phi_{tsh}(G))] = \frac{h}{i} Op_h^{weyl}(\{H(.,t), \Phi_{ts}(G)\}) + OP_h^{weyl}\Big(R_h^{(2)}(H(.,t)\ , \Phi_{ts}(G))\Big).$$

Consequently:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} Op_h^{weyl}(\Phi_{ts}(G)) - \frac{i}{h}[\widehat{H}_h(t), Op_h^{weyl}(\Phi_{ts}(G))] = -\frac{i}{h} OP_h^{weyl}\Big(R_h^{(2)}(H(.,t), \Phi_{ts}(G))\Big).$$

On the other hand,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} G_h(t,s)(OP_h^{weyl}(G)) - \frac{i}{h}[\widehat{H}_h(t), G_h(t,s)(OP_h^{weyl}(G))] = 0$$

By combining these two equalities, noting that for $t = s$, the two operators $G_h(s,s)(Op_h^{weyl}(G))$ and $Op_h^{weyl}(\Phi_{ss}(G))$ are equal, and then by using Duhamel ' s principle, we obtain (4.11), with:

$$R(., t_1, s, h) = -\frac{i}{h} R_h^{(2)}\Big(H(., t_1), \Phi_{t_1 s}(G)\Big).$$

It is well known that, when $F(x,\xi) = |\xi|^2$, one has $R_h^{(2)}\Big(F, G\Big) = 0$ for every function G. Hence:

$$R(., t_1, s, h) = -\frac{i}{h^2} R_h^{(2)}\Big(V(., t_1), \Phi_{t_1 s}(G)\Big).$$

By hypothesis, $V(., t_1)$ is in $W^{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and is bounded, independently of t_1. We have seen that $\Phi_{t_1 s}(G)$ is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, independently bounded of t_1 and of s when (t_1, s) varies in a compact set of $\mathbb{R}^2$. According to theorem 3.1, applied to the case $N = 2$, it follows that $R(., t_1, s, h)$ is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, independently bounded of t_1 and of s when (t_1, s) varies in a compact set of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and h in $(0, 1]$.

Proof of theorem 4.2. First step. Let F be a function in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. Let $A_h = Op_h^{weyl}(F)$. Let $\Phi_{ts}(G)$ be the function verifying (4.10). For every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we define a function $D_0(t)(.)$ in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ by

$$D_0(., t) = \Phi_{t,0}(F). \tag{4.12}$$

We have seen that this function is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, independently bounded of t on every compact set of $\mathbb{R}$. By lemma 4.3 applied to $G = F$ and $s = 0$, and from (4.12), one has:

$$G_h(t,0)(A_h) = Op_h^{weyl}(D_0(t)) + h \int_0^t G_h(t, t_1)\Big(Op_h^{weyl}(R_1(., t_1, h))\Big)\ dt_1,$$

where $R_1(., t_1, h)$ stays bounded in $W^{\infty 1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}$ when t_1 belongs to a compact set of $\mathbb{R}$ and h is in $(0, 1]$. We reiterate, by applying 4.3 with $s = t_1$ and $G = R_1(., t_1, h)$. We obtain:

$$G_h(t, t_1)\Big(Op_h^{weyl}(R_1(., t_1, h)) = Op_h^{weyl}\Big(\Phi(t, t_1)(R_1(., t_1, h))\Big) + h \int_{t_1}^t G_h(t, t_2)(Op_h^{weyl}(R_2(., t_2, t_1, h)))dt_2,$$

where $R_2(., t_2, t_1, h)$ stays bounded in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ when (t_1, t_2) belongs to a compact set of $\mathbb{R}^2$ and h is in $(0, 1]$. We define a function $D_1(., t)$ in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ by:

$$D_1(., t) = \int_0^t \Phi(t, t_1)(R_1(., t_1, h))dt_1.$$

This function is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, independently bounded of t on very compact set of $\mathbb{R}$. One has, if $t > 0$:

$$G_h(t,0)(A_h) = Op_h^{weyl}\Big(D_0(t) + hD_1(t)\Big) + h^2 \int_{0<t_1<t_2<t} G_h(t,t_2)\Big(Op_h^{weyl}(R_2(.,t_2,t_1,h))\Big)dt_1\ dt_2.$$

By reiterating this process, we obtain, for every N, the equality (4.9), with:

$$E_N(t,h) = \int_{\Delta_N(t,0)} G_h(t,t_N)\Big(Op_h^{weyl}(R_N(.,t_N,...,t_1,h))\Big)\ dt_1...dt_N, \tag{4.13}$$

where $\Delta_N(t,s)$ is the set defined, if $s < t$, by:

$$\Delta_N(t,s) = \{(t_1,...t_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N, \qquad s < t_1 < ... < t_N < t\}, \tag{4.14}$$

and in a symmetric way if $s > t$. In (4.9), the $D_j(.,t,h)$ $(j \geq 0)$, and $R_N(.,t_N,...,t_1,h)$, are in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, independently bounded of h in $(0,1]$, of $(t_1,...t_N)$ in $\Delta_N(t,0)$, and of t in a compact set of $\mathbb{R}$.

The second step will consist in getting upper bounds for trace norms of iterated commutators of $E_N(t,h)$ with the position and momentum operators, with the help of a less precise technique than the one used in the first step for powers of h. However this lesser precision will be compensated by the presence of the factor h^N in (4.9). In order to do that, we will use the following lemma, that will be useful also in section 5 and in a second article. (part II of this work). If an operator A is bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, as well as all its iterated commutators up to order m, we set:

$$I_h^{m\infty}(A) = \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq m} \|(ad\ Q(h))^\beta (ad\ P(h))^\alpha A\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})}. \tag{4.15}$$

If an operator A in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is trace class, as well as all its iterated commutators up to order m, we set:

$$I_h^{m,tr}(A) = \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta|\leq m} \|(ad\ Q(h))^\beta (ad\ P(h))^\alpha A\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})}. \tag{4.16}$$

The aim of the next lemma is to show that these properties are stable par the mapping $G_h(t,s)$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\widehat{H}_h(t)$ be the operator defined in (4.3), where $V(.,t)$ verifies (4.1). Let $U_h(t,s)$ denote the unitary propagator and $G_h(t,s)$ the map of proposition 4.1. Let A be a trace class operator in $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$, as well as all iterated commutators $(ad\ Q(h))^\beta(ad\ P(h))^\alpha A$ for $|\alpha| + |\beta| \leq m$. Then, for all s and t in $\mathbb{R}$, the operator $G_h(t,s)(A)$ is also trace class, as well as all iterated commutators with the $P_j(h)$ and $Q_j(h)$ up to order m. Moreover, for every compact set K of $\mathbb{R}$, there exists $C_K > 0$ such that:*

$$I_h^{m,tr}(G_h(t,s)(A)) \leq C_K I_h^{m,tr}(A) \qquad (s,t) \in K^2, \quad h \in (0,1]. \tag{4.17}$$

An identical result holds for bounded operators and for the norms $I_h^{m,\infty}$.

We see why this lemma alone does not allow to prove theorem 4.2. One will need, for that, that in the expression (4.16), the terms corresponding to the multi-index (α,β) be multiplied by $h^{-|\alpha|-|\beta|}$.

Proof of Lemma. By (4.7) one checks that for every operator A verifying the hypothesis of the lemma, and for each of the momentum operators $P_j(h)$, the following equality:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}[P_j(h), G_h(t,s)(A)] - \frac{1}{ih}\big[\widehat{H}_h(t), [P_j(h), G_h(t,s)(A)]\big] = \frac{1}{ih}\big[[P_j(h), \widehat{H}_h(t)], G_h(t,s)(A)\big].$$

Then it results, by the Duhamel principle, the following equality:

$$[P_j(h), G_h(t,s)(A)] = G_h(t,s)\Big([P_j(h), A]\Big) + \frac{1}{ih}\int_s^t G_h(t,t_1)\Big(\big[[P_j(h), \widehat{H}_h(t_1)], G_h(t_1,s)(A)\big]\Big)dt_1.$$

We have an analogous equality for the position operators $Q_j(h)$. One has:

$$[P_j(h), \widehat{H}_h(t)] = \frac{h}{i}\frac{\partial V(.,t)}{\partial x_j} \qquad\qquad [Q_j(h), \widehat{H}_h(t)] = 2ihP_j(h).$$

We therefore deduce:

$$[P_j(h), G_h(t,s)(A)] = G_h(t,s)\Big([P_j(h), A]\Big) - \int_s^t G_h(t,t_1)\Big(\Big[\frac{\partial V(.,t_1)}{\partial x_j}, G_h(t_1,s)(A)\Big]\Big)dt_1,$$

$$[Q_j(h), G_h(t,s)(A)] = G_h(t,s)\Big([Q_j(h), A]\Big) + 2\int_s^t G_h(t,t_1)\Big(\Big[P_j(h), G_h(t_1,s)(A)\Big]\Big)dt_1.$$

If A and its commutators with $P_j(h)$ and $Q_j(h)$ are trace class, we first observe that $[P_j(h), G_h(t,s)(A)]$ is a trace class operator since $G_h(t,s)$ conserves $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})$. Reporting in the second equality, we see that $[Q_j(h), G_h(t,s)(A)]$ is itself a trace class operator, and that the upper bound (4.17) is proved for $m = 1$. We pursue the same reasoning to prove (4.17), by induction, for every m. The analogue (4.17) for the bounded operators is proved similarly.

Proof of theorem 4.2. Second step . Following proposition 2.1, it suffices to show that, for every multi-index (α, β) and for every compact set K of $\mathbb{R}$, there exists $C_{\alpha\beta K} > 0$ such that:

$$h^{n-(|\alpha|+|\beta|)}\|(ad\ P(h))^{\alpha}(ad\ Q(h))^{\beta} G_h(t,0)(A_h)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq C_{\alpha\beta K}, \tag{4.18}$$

if $t \in K$ and $h \in (0,1]$. In order to achieve this, one will use the asymptotic expansion (4.9) up to an order N that will depend on α and β. Since from the first step the $D_j(.,t,h)$ $(j \geq 0)$ of (4.9) belong to $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, and are bounded independently of $h \in (0,1]$ and of t in a compact set of $\mathbb{R}$, the proposition 2.1 shows that:

$$h^{n-(|\alpha|+|\beta|)}\|(ad\ P(h))^{\alpha}(ad\ Q(h))^{\beta} Op_h^{weyl}(D_j(.,t,h))\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq C_{\alpha\beta K}$$

if $t \in K$ et $h \in (0,1]$. Let us derive now an upper bound that is the analogue for the term $E_N(t,s,h)$. For this, we use the form (4.13) of $E_N(t,s,h)$, and we apply lemma 4.4 with (t,s) remplaced by (t,t_N) and A by $Op_h^{weyl}(R_N(.,t_N,...,t_1,h))$. Since $R_N(.,t_N,...,t_1,h)$ is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and is independently bounded for h in $(0,1]$, of $(t_1,...t_N)$ in $\Delta_N(0,t)$, and for t in a compact set of $\mathbb{R}$, proposition 2.1 shows that for every integer $m \geq 0$, for every compact set K of $\mathbb{R}$, there exists $C > 0$ such that :

$$h^n I_h^{m,tr}(Op_h^{weyl}(R_N(.,t_N,...,t_1,h))) \leq C_{mK}$$

if $0 < h \leq 1$, $(t_1,...t_N) \in \Delta_N(0,t)$, and $t \in K$. Hence by lemma 4.4, we deduce that the iterated commutators of $G_h(t,t_N)(Op_h^{weyl}(R_N(.,t_N,...,t_1,h)))$ with the position and momentum operators are themselves trace class, and that there exists another constant C_{mK} such that:

$$h^n I_h^{m,tr}\Big(G_h(t,t_N)(Op_h^{weyl}(R_N(.,t_N,...,t_1,h)))\Big) \leq C_{mK}.$$

We can therefore write, if $A_h = Op_h^{weyl}(F)$, for every multi-index (α,β) and for every integer N:

$$h^n\|(ad\ Q(h))^{\beta}(ad\ P(h))^{\alpha} E_N(t,h)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq C_{\alpha\beta N}$$

By reporting this in (4.9), and by choosing $N = |\alpha| + |\beta|$, one deduces (4.18). Using the characterization of C. Rondeaux (proposition 2.1), the theorem 4.2 follows.

□

Proof of theorem 1.1.

Let $\rho_h(t)$ be a classical solution of (TDHF) verifying the hypotheses of theorem 1.1. Let us denote by $V_h(t)$ the operator of multiplication by the following function

$$x \to V_q(x, \rho_h(t)) = V(x) + Tr(W_x \circ \rho_h(t)), \qquad W_x(y) = W(x-y). \tag{4.19}$$

Under the hypotheses of theorem 1.1, $\rho_h(0) \geq 0$. By the results of [BdPF1] and [BdPF2], $\rho_h(t) \geq 0$ for all t, and the trace norm of $\rho_h(t)$ is constant. Since all the derivatives of V et W are bounded , one has:

$$|\partial_x^\alpha V_q(\rho_h(t))(x)| \leq C_\alpha, \qquad (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.20}$$

Let $\widehat{H}_h(t)$ denote the operator defined in (4.3), where $V(t)$ is the multiplication by $V_q(x, \rho_h(t))$. With these notations, the equation (TDHF) has the form:

$$ih \frac{d\rho_h(t)}{dt} = [\widehat{H}_h(t), \rho_h(t)]. \tag{4.21}$$

We note that $V(t)$ depends on h. However in theorem 4.2, $V(t)$ may depend on a parameter that could be h. The only requirement is that $V_q(., \rho_h(t))$ be bounded in $W^{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ independently of h, which is the case. By denoting $G_h(t,s)$ the unitary propagator associated to the Hamiltonian $H_h(t)$ as in proposition 4.1, one has therefore:

$$\rho_h(t) = G_h(t,0)(\rho_h(0)) = G_h(t,0)(Op_h^{weyl}(F_h)).$$

Theorem 1.1 is therefore a particular case of theorem 4.2.

5. Proof of theorem 1.2.

We are going to state precisely the "explicit" construction of an "approximate solution to order N", denoted by $\rho_h^{(N)}(t)$, of the (TDHF) equation. The exact solution $\rho_h(t)$ is determined by the interaction potentials V et W, which belong to $W^{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and the initial data $\rho_h(0)$. Under the hypotheses of theorem 1.1, the operator $\rho_h(0)$ is ≥ 0, and is of the form

$$\rho_h(0) = (2\pi h)^n \; Op_h^{weyl}(F_h)$$

with F_h in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. This function may depend on h, but stays bounded in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ independently of h in $(0,1]$.

We look for an approximate solution with the ansatz (1.13), where $F^{(N)}(t,h)$ is a function $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$ of the form (1.11), the functions $u_j(.,t)$ being in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. We associate to this approximate solution the average quantum potential:

$$V_q(x, \rho_h^{(N)}(t)) = V(x) + Tr(W_x \rho_h^{(N)}(t)). \tag{5.1}$$

One knows that, if F is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and G in $W^{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, one has:

$$Tr(Op_h^{weyl}(F) \circ Op_h^{weyl}(G)) = (2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} F(X)G(X)dX.$$

Therefore, if $\rho_h^{(N)}(t)$ is defined by (1.13), we have:

$$V_q(x, \rho_h^{(N)}(t)) = V_{cl}(x, F^{(N)}(., t, h)), \tag{5.2}$$

where, for every function G in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, the function $V_{cl}(., G)$ is defined as in (1.1):

$$V_{cl}(x, G) = V(x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} W(x-y) G(y, \eta) dy d\eta. \tag{5.3}$$

One shows similarly that:

$$V_q(x,\rho_h(t)) = V_{cl}(x, u_h(.,t)), \tag{5.4}$$

where u_h is defined in (1.7). For all suitable functions A and B , let us denote by $M_h(A,B)$ the Moyal bracket of A and B, defined in (3.2). With these notations, the function $u_h(.,t)$ defined in (1.7) must verify:

$$\frac{\partial u_h(.,t)}{\partial t} + 2\sum_{j=1}^{n} \xi_j \frac{\partial u_h(.,t)}{\partial \xi_j} = \frac{1}{ih} M_h\Big(V_{cl}(u_h(.,t)), u_h(.,t)\Big). \tag{5.5}$$

For all functions A and B in $C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, and for every integer $k \geq 0$, let $C_k(A,B,.)$ the function defined in (3.4). We set $C_0(A,B) = 0$. One has $C_1(A,B) = \frac{1}{i}\{A,B\}$. We will choose the u_j in a such a way that the equation (5.5) is approximatively verified.

The construction of the functions u_j of theorem 1.2 is detailed in the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1. *There exists a sequence of functions $(X,t) \to u_j(X,t)$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}$ $(j \geq 0)$, such that:*
a) The function $t \to u_j(.,t,h)$ is C^∞ on $\mathbb{R}$ valued in $W^{\infty,1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, bounded in that space independently of h in $(0,1]$ and of t in every compact set of $\mathbb{R}$.
b) One has:

$$u_0(X,0) = F_h(X), \qquad\qquad u_j(X,0,h) = 0, \qquad (j \geq 1).$$

c) For every N, the function $u_N(X,t,h)$ verifies:

$$\frac{\partial u_N}{\partial t} + 2\sum_{j=1}^{n} \xi_j \frac{\partial u_N}{\partial x_j} = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{j+k+\ell=N+1} C_k\Big(V_{cl}(.,u_j(.,t,h))\ ,\ u_\ell(.,t,h)\Big). \tag{5.6}$$

In the sum (5.6) the indices j et ℓ are ≥ 0 and k is ≥ 1.

Détermination of u_0. For $N = 0$, the equation (5.6) reduces to the Vlasov's equation:

$$\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial t} + 2\sum_{j=1}^{n} \xi_j \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial x_j} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} V_{cl}(u_0(.,t))\ \frac{\partial u_0(.,t)}{\partial \xi_j}$$

It is well known that there exists a unique solution of the Cauchy problem, verifying this equation and $u_0(.,0,h) = F_h$, where F_h is a given function in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. One knows that then the function u_0 is continous on $\mathbb{R}$ valued in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. If F_h stays bounded in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ independently of h, it is also the case for $u_0(.,t,h)$.

Détermination of u_N $(N \geq 1)$. For every $N \geq 1$, the equation (5.6) can be written as:

$$\frac{\partial u_N}{\partial t} + 2\sum_{j=1}^{n} \xi_j \frac{\partial u_N}{\partial x_j} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} V_{cl}(u_0(.,t,h))\ \frac{\partial u_N(.,t)}{\partial \xi_j} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} V_{cl}(u_N(.,t,h))\ \frac{\partial u_0(.,t,h)}{\partial \xi_j} + G_N(X,t,h),$$

$$G_N = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{\substack{j+k+\ell=N+1 \\ j<N, \ell<N}} C_k\Big(V_{cl}(u_j(.,t,h))\ ,\ u_\ell(.,t,h)\Big).$$

One also requires that $u_N(X,0,h) = 0$. To solve this equation, by dropping the parameter h for the sake of simplifying notations, let us denote by $X \to \varphi_t(X) = (q(t,X), p(t,X))$ the the Hamiltonian flow, solution of:

$$q'(t,X) = 2p(t,X) \qquad\qquad p'(t,X) = -\nabla V(q(t,X)) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \nabla W(q(t,X) - y) u_0(y,\eta,t) dy d\eta,$$

verifying :

$$q(0,X)=x \qquad\qquad p(0,X)=\xi \qquad\qquad X=(x,\xi).$$

The function v_N defined by $v_N(X,t)=u_N(\varphi_t(X),t)$ must verify:

$$\frac{\partial v_N}{\partial t}=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \xi_j}(\varphi_t(X),t)\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}}\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_j}(q_t(X)-y)\ u_N(y,\eta,t)\ dyd\eta+\widetilde{G}_N(X,t),$$

$$\widetilde{G}_N(X,t)=G_N(\varphi_t(X),t).$$

By using in the integral the change of variable $(y,\eta)=\varphi_t(z,\zeta)$, whose jacobian equals 1, we see that v_N must satisfy

$$\frac{\partial v_N}{\partial t}(X,t)=\widetilde{G}_N(X,t)+\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}}A(X,Y,t)v_N(Y,t)dY,$$

$$A(X,Y,t)=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\partial u_0}{\partial \xi_j}\big(\varphi_t(X),t\big)\ \frac{\partial W}{\partial x_j}\big(q_t(X)-q_t(Y)\big).$$

Moreover, one must have $v_N(.,0)=0$. According to standard results on the Vlasov equation, one knows that $\nabla u_0(.,t)$ is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, bounded when t varies in a compact set. The same is true for $\nabla\varphi_t$. If the u_j $(0\leq j<N)$ have been built with the properties of proposition 5.1, one sees that $G_N(.,t)$ is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, bounded when t varies in a compact set. It is also the case for $\widetilde{G}_N(.,t)$. The resolution of the Cauchy problem verified by v_N and the one verified by u_N is standard.

□

To prove theorem 1.2, we will show that the functions $F^{(N)}(t,h)(X)$ defined in (1.11), starting from the $u_j(.,t,h)$ of proposition 5.1, and the operators $\rho_h^{(N)}(t)$ defined in (1.13), verify (1.12) and (1.14). The next proposition is an intermediate step.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\rho_h(t)$ be an exact solution of (TDHF) verifying the hypotheses of theorems 1.1 and 1.2. Let $\widehat{H}_h(t)$ be the operator defined in (4.3), where $V(t)$ is the multiplication by $V_q(x,\rho_h(t))$. Then the above constructed approximate solution $\rho_h^{(N)}(t)$ verify:*

$$ih\frac{d\rho_h^{(N)}(t)}{dt}=[\widehat{H}_h(t),\rho_h^{(N)}(t)]+Op_h^{weyl}\Big(S_h^{(N)}(.,t)\Big) \tag{5.7}$$

where $S_h^{(N)}(.,t)$ is in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and verify, for every integer α:

$$\|\nabla^\alpha S_h^{(N)}(.,t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}\leq C_{\alpha N}(t)\Big[h^{N+2}+h\|\rho_h(t)-\rho_h^{(N)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})}\Big] \tag{5.8}$$

where $C_{\alpha N}(t)$ is a bounded function on every compact set.

Proof. If the u_j are determined relying on proposition 5.1, the function $F^{(N)}$ defined in (1.11) verifies:

$$\frac{\partial F^{(N)}}{\partial t}+2\sum_{j=1}^{n}\xi_j\frac{\partial F^{(N)}}{\partial x_j}=\frac{1}{h}\sum_{k=1}^{N+1}h^kC_k\Big(V_{cl}(.,F^{(N)}(.,t,h))\ ,\ F^{(N)}(.,t,h)\Big)+\Phi^{(N)}(.,t,h), \tag{5.9}$$

where $\Phi^{(N)}(.,t,h)$ is a function in $W^{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, such that:

$$\|\nabla^\alpha\Phi^{(N)}(.,t,h)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}\leq h^{N+1}C_{\alpha N}(t). \tag{5.10}$$

We define an approximate version of the operator $\widehat{H}_h(t)$ by setting :

$$\widehat{H}_h^{APP}(t)=-h^2\Delta+V_{cl}(F^{(N)}(.,t,h)). \tag{5.11}$$

Since $F^{(N)}$ verifies (5.9), we may write:

$$ih\frac{d\rho_h^{(N)}(t)}{dt} = [\widehat{H}_h^{APP}(t), \rho_h^{(N)}(t)] + Op_h^{weyl}\Big(T_h^{(N)}(.,t)\Big), \tag{5.12}$$

where the function $T_h^{(N)}(.,t)$ is defined by:

$$T_h^{(N)}(.,t) = h\Phi^{(N)}(.,t,h) + R_h^{(N+2)}\big(V_{cl}(.,F^{(N)}(.,t,h)), F^{(N)}(.,t,h)\big).$$

(For all functions A et B verifying the hypotheses of theorem 3.1, we denote by $R_h^{(N)}(A,B,.)$ the function associated by theorem 3.1. to such functions.) Then by the definition (5.3) of the map V_{cl}, and point a) of proposition 5.1, we can write:

$$\|\nabla_x^\alpha V_{cl}(.,F^{(N)}(.,t,h))\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C_{\alpha N}(t), \qquad \|\nabla^\beta F^{(N)}(.,t,h))\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C_{\beta N}(t). \tag{5.13}$$

Using these upper bounds and following theorem 3.1 on the Moyal bracket, we may write:

$$\Big\|\nabla^\ell R_h^{(N+2)}(V_{cl}\big(.,F^{(N)}(.,t,h)), F^{(N)}(.,t,h)\big)\Big\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C_{\ell N}(t)h^{N+2}.$$

Acccording to these upper bound estimates, and the estimates (5.10) of the derivatives of $\Phi^{(N)}(.,t,h)$, one has:

$$\|\nabla^\alpha T_h^{(N)}(.,t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C_{\alpha N}(t)h^{N+2}. \tag{5.14}$$

According to (5.12) and since

$$\widehat{H}_h^{APP}(t) - \widehat{H}_h(t) = V_q(.,\rho_h(t)) - V_q(.,\rho_h^{(N)}(t)),$$

we write the equality (5.7) with:

$$S_h^{(N)}(.,t) = T_h^{(N)}(.,t) + M_h\Big(V_q(.,\rho_h(t)) - V_q(.,\rho_h^{(N)}(t)), F^{(N)}(.,t,h)\Big). \tag{5.15}$$

One has:

$$\Big\|\nabla_x^\alpha\Big(V_q(.,\rho_h(t)) - V_q(.,\rho_h^{(N)}(t))\Big)\Big\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C_\alpha\ \|\rho_h(t) - \rho_h^{(N)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})}.$$

Using all of these estimates and the L^1 norm estimates (5.13) of $F^{(N)}(.,t,h)$ and by using theorem 3.1 on the Moyal bracket, it results that:

$$\Big\|\nabla^\alpha M_h\Big(V_q(\rho_h(t)) - V_q(\rho_h^{(N)}(t)), F^{(N)}(.,t,h)\Big)\Big\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C(t)h\|\rho_h(t) - \rho_h^{(N)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})}. \tag{5.16}$$

The norm upper bound estimate 5.8) of $S_h^{(N)}(.,t)$ results from (5.15), (5.14) and (5.16).

End of the proof of theorem 1.2. Let $U_h(t,s)$ and $G_h(t,s)$ be the unitary propagator and the mapping, defined in proposition 4.1, associated to the operator $\widehat{H}_h(t)$ of proposition 5.2. The comparison of equalities (4.21) (verified by the exact solution) and (5.7) (verified by the approximate solution), and the Duhamel principle, allows us to write:

$$\rho_h(t) - \rho_h^{(N)}(t) = \frac{i}{h}\int_0^t G_h(t,s)\Big(Op_h^{weyl}((S_h^{(N)}(.,s)))\Big)ds. \tag{5.17}$$

Since $U_h(t,s)$ is unitary, the map $G_h(t,s)$ conserves the trace norm, and from this we may deduce that:

$$\|\rho_h(t) - \rho_h^{(N)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq \frac{1}{h}\int_0^t \|Op_h^{weyl}(S_h^{(N)}(.,s))\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})}\ ds.$$

Using the upper bounds (5.8) of Proposition 5.2, and according to proposition 2.1, we obtain:

$$\|\rho_h(t) - \rho_h^{(N)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq \frac{1}{h}\int_0^t C(s)[h^{N+2} + h\|\rho_h(s) - \rho_h^{(N)}(s)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})}]\, ds.$$

By the Gronwall lemma, we deduce, with a different constant that

$$\|\rho_h(t) - \rho_h^{(N)}(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq C(t)h^{N+1}.$$

Therefore point (1.14) of theorem 1.2 is proved. We deduce from this inequality and from (5.8) that:

$$\|\nabla^\alpha S_h^{(N)}(.,t)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C_{\alpha N}(t)h^{N+2}.$$

where $C_{\alpha N}(t)$ is a bounded function on every compact set. From proposition 2.1 and lemma 4.4, for every multi-index $(\alpha\beta)$, the operators:

$$h^{-N-2}\ (ad\ Q(h))^\beta (ad\ P(h))^\alpha G_h(t,s)(Op_h^{weyl}\Big(S_h^{(N)}(.,s)\Big)$$

are trace class, and their trace norm is independently bounded of (t,s) in a compact set of $\mathbb{R}$, and of h in $(0,1]$. By (5.17), for every multi-index (α,β), and for every $N > 0$, there exists a function $C_{\alpha N}(t) > 0$, bounded on every compact set of $\mathbb{R}$, such that:

$$\|(ad\ Q(h))^\beta (ad\ P(h))^\alpha \Big(\rho_h(t) - \rho_h^{(N)}(t)\Big)\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \leq C_{\alpha N}(t)h^{N+1}.$$

Using proposition 2.1, point b), we deduce:

$$(2\pi h)^{-n}\|\sigma_h^{weyl}\Big(\rho_h(t) - \rho_h^{(N)}(t)\Big)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C(t)h^{(N+1)-\frac{2n+2}{2}}.$$

In other words, with the notations of theorem 1.2:

$$\|u_h(.,t) - F^{(N)}(.,t,h)\Big)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C(t)h^N.$$

Theorem 1.2 results from the above considerations.

Appendix A. Proof of proposition 2.1.

The proof of proposition 2.1 calls upon a different notion of symbol. One can associate to every bounded operator A in $\mathcal{H}$ a $S_h(A)$ sur $\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ defined by:

$$(A.1) \qquad S_h(A)(X,Y) = \frac{< A\Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} >}{< \Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} >},$$

where the Ψ_{Xh} are defined in (2.14). An explicit computation of integrals shows that:

$$(A.2) \qquad | < \Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} > | = e^{-\frac{1}{4h}|X-Y|^2} \qquad\qquad \|\Psi_{Xh}\| = 1.$$

Consequently:

$$(A.3) \qquad \Big|S_h(A)(X,Y)\Big| = e^{\frac{1}{4h}|X-Y|^2}| < A\Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} > |.$$

The interest of considering this function $S_h(A)$ (which is up to a slight modification what Folland [F] calls Wick symbol), is that it is related to the Weyl symbol, in both ways, by integral operators (proposition A1), and that it can be majorized (in one norm) and minorized (in a different norm) by the trace norm of A (proposition A2).

Proposition A.1. *The Weyl symbol of an operator A is related to the function $S_h(A)$ by*

$$S_h(A)(X,Y) = (\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} e^{-\frac{1}{h}(Z-X).(\overline{Z}-\overline{Y})}\ \sigma_h^{weyl}(A)(Z)\ dZ, \tag{A.4}$$

$$\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)(Z) = 2^n(2\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} S_h(A)(X,Y)\ K_h(X,Y,Z)\ dXdY, \tag{A.5}$$

$$K_h(X,Y,Z) = e^{-\frac{1}{h}(\overline{Z}-\overline{X})(Z-Y)-\frac{1}{2h}|X-Y|^2}. \tag{A.6}$$

By the definition formula (2.3) of the Weyl calculus, one has:

$$A = (\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \Sigma_{Zh}\ \sigma_h^{weyl}(A)(Z)\ dZ,$$

where Σ_{Zh} is the operator defined in (2.4). An explicit computation shows that:

$$\frac{< \Sigma_{Zh}\Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} >}{< \Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} >} = e^{-\frac{1}{h}(Z-X).(\overline{Z}-\overline{Y})}. \tag{A.7}$$

The equality (A.4) follows. By the fundamental formula (2.16) of coherent states, on has:

$$A = (2\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} < A\Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} > P_{XYh} dXdY, \tag{A.8}$$

where P_{XYh} is the operator defined by:

$$P_{XYh}f =< f, \Psi_{Xh} > \Psi_{Yh}. \tag{A.9}$$

One knows from (2.5) that:

$$\sigma_h^{weyl}(P_{XYh})(Z) = 2^n \mathrm{Tr}(P_{XYh} \circ \Sigma_Z) = 2^n < \Sigma_{Zh}\Psi_{Yh}, \Psi_{Xh} > .$$

By computation (A.7) (where X et Y are permuted) we may deduce:

$$\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)(Z) = 2^n(2\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} S_h(A)(X,Y)\ | < \Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} > |^2 e^{-\frac{1}{h}(\overline{Z}-\overline{X})(Z-Y)} dXdY.$$

Using the equality (2.15) on the scalar product of coherent states, we obtain (A.5).

Proposition A.2. *Let A be a trace class operator and G a function in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. Then one has :*

$$(2\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} \left| < A\Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} > G\left(\frac{X-Y}{\sqrt{h}}\right) \right| dXdY \le (2\pi)^{-n} \|G\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \|A\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})}, \tag{A.10}$$

$$\|A\|_{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathcal{H})} \le (2\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} \left| < A\Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} > \right| dXdY. \tag{A.11}$$

Proof. We may write $A = B_1 B_2$, where B_1 and B_2 are Hilbert-Schmidt. By using the fundamental property (2.16) of coherent states one sees that, for all X et Y in R^{2n}:

$$< A\Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} > = < B_2\Psi_{Xh}, B_1^\star \Psi_{Yh} > = (2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} u_{Zh}(X)\ v_{Zh}(Y)\ dZ,$$

where we have denoted by $u_{Zh}(X) = < B_2\Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Zh} >$ and $v_{Zh}(X) = < \Psi_{Zh}, B_1^\star \Psi_{Xh} >$. Let I_h be the left hand side of (A.10). By the Schur lemma:

$$I_h \leq (2\pi h)^{-3n} h^n \|G\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \|u_{Zh}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}\ \|v_{Zh}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} dZ.$$

By (2.16), we have $\|u_{Zh}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} = (2\pi h)^{n/2} \|B_2^\star \Psi_{Zh}\|$ et $\|v_{Zh}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} = (2\pi h)^{n/2} \|B_1 \Psi_{Zh}\|$. Hence :

$$I_h \leq (2\pi h)^{-2n} h^n \|G\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \|B_1\Psi_{Zh}\|\ \|B_2^\star \Psi_{Zh}\|\ dZ$$

By the fundamental property of coherent states:

$$(2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \|B_j \Psi_{Zh}\|^2 dZ = (2\pi h)^{-n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} < B_j^\star B_j \Psi_{Zh}, \Psi_{Zh} >\ dZ$$

$$= \mathrm{Tr}(B_j^\star B_j) = \|B_j\|^2_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H})}$$

where $\|B_j\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H})}$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of B_j. Therefore:

$$I_h \leq (2\pi)^{-n} \|G\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}\ \|B_1\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H})}\ \|B_2\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathcal{H})}.$$

By taking the infimum over all the decompositions $A = B_1 B_2$, one gets (A.10). The inequality (A.11) is then deduced from the equality (A.8) since the operators P_{XYh} have a trace norm equal to 1.

□

Proof of proposition 2.1. For point a), we use the equality (A.4), by integrating by parts , as in Rondeaux [R]. Hence we have shown:

$$(2\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} e^{-\frac{1}{4h}|X-Y|^2}\ |S_h(A)(X,Y)| dX dY \leq C h^{-n} \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq 2n+2} h^{(|\alpha|+|\beta|)/2} \|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta F\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}.$$

One deduces then the upper bound estimate of the trace norm of A (point a) by using the second point of proposition A2.

For points b) et c), we are going to integrate by parts in the second equality (A.5) of proposition A.1. One verifies that the function K_h defined in (A.6) is invariant by the following differential operator:

$$L(h) K_h = K_h \qquad\qquad L(h) = \left(1 + \frac{|X-Y|^2}{h}\right)^{-1}\ (1 + (\overline{Y} - \overline{X})\partial_X).$$

Thus, equality (A.5) implies, for every integer N:

$$|\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)(Z)| \leq 2^n (2\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} |K_h(X,Y,Z)|\ |({}^t L(h))^N S_h(A)(X,Y)|\ dX dY.$$

One verifies that:

$$|K_h(X,Y,Z)| = e^{-\frac{1}{h}|Z - \frac{X+Y}{2}|^2 - \frac{1}{4h}|X-Y|^2}.$$

On chooses $N = 2n+2$. There exists $C > 0$ such that:

$$|\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)(Z)| \ \leq ...$$

$$... \leq C \sum_{|\alpha| \leq 2n+2} h^{|\alpha|/2} (2\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} |K_h(X,Y,Z)| G\left(\frac{X-Y}{\sqrt{h}}\right) \ |\partial_X^\alpha S_h(A)(X,Y)| \ dXdY,$$

$$G(X) = (1+|X|)^{-2n-2}.$$

By the formula on the commutators:

$$|\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)(Z)| \ \leq ...$$

$$\leq C \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq 2n+2} h^{-2n-(|\alpha|+|\beta|)/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} e^{-\frac{1}{h}|Z-\frac{X+Y}{2}|^2 - \frac{1}{4h}|X-Y|^2} G\left(\frac{X-Y}{\sqrt{h}}\right) \ |S_h(A_{\alpha\beta h})(X,Y)| \ dXdY,$$

$$A_{\alpha\beta h} = (ad \ P(h))^\alpha (ad \ Q(h))^\beta A.$$

The above equality can be also written as:

$$|\sigma_h^{weyl}(A)(Z)| \ \leq ...$$

$$\leq C \sum_{|\alpha|+|\beta| \leq 2n+2} h^{-2n-(|\alpha|+|\beta|)/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} e^{-\frac{1}{h}|Z-\frac{X+Y}{2}|^2} G\left(\frac{X-Y}{\sqrt{h}}\right) \ | < (A_{\alpha\beta h} \Psi_{Xh}, \Psi_{Yh} > | \ dXdY.$$

Inequality (2.13) is a consequence of the first point of proposition A.2, and point b) follows easily.

Appendix B. Proof of theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

First step, common to both theorems 3.1 and 3.2. We know that, for all suitable functions F et G , $Op_h^{weyl}(F) \circ Op_h^{weyl}(G) = Op_h^{weyl}(C_h(F,G,.)$, with:

$$C_h(F,G,X) = (\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} e^{-\frac{2i}{h}\sigma(Y-X,Z-X)} F(Y)G(Z) dYdZ$$

where σ is the symplectic form $\sigma((x,\xi),(y,\eta)) = y\xi - x\eta$. Consequently the Moyal bracket $M_h(F,G,.)$ is defined by $M_h(F,G,X) = C_h(F,G,X) - C_h(G,F,X)$. Thus, it suffices to write an asymptotic expansion $C_h(F,G,.)$. We may write $C_h(F,G,X) = \Phi_h(X,1)$, by setting, for every $\theta \in [0,1]$:

$$\Phi_h(X,\theta) = (\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} e^{-\frac{2i}{h}\sigma(Y-X,Z-X)} \ F(Y) G(X+\theta(Z-X)) dYdZ.$$

Consequently, for every integer N:

$$C_h(F,G,X) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{k!} \partial_t^k \Phi_h(X,0) + \widetilde{R}_h^{(N)}(F,G,X)$$

with:

$$\widetilde{R}_h^{(N)}(F,G,X) = \int_0^1 \frac{(1-\theta)^{N-1}}{(N-1)!} \partial_\theta^N \Phi_h(X,\theta) d\theta.$$

One sees, using integration by parts, that:

$$\partial_\theta^k \Phi(X,\theta,h) = \left(\frac{h}{2i}\right)^k (\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} e^{-\frac{2i}{h}\sigma(Y-X,Z-X)} \ \Big(\sigma(\nabla_1,\nabla_2)^k (F \otimes G)\Big)(Y, X+\theta(Z-X)) \ dYdZ.$$

If a function Φ depends only on the Y variable one has (in the sense of distributions):

$$(\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}} e^{-\frac{2i}{h}\sigma(Y-X,Z-X)} \Phi(Y) dY dZ = \Phi(X)$$

and similarly if Φ depends only on the Z variable. For $\theta = 0$, one has, by the above two equalities:

$$\partial_\theta^k \Phi(X,0,h) = \left(\frac{h}{2i}\right)^k \sigma(\nabla_1, \nabla_2)^k (F \otimes G)(X,X).$$

Therefore we do have indeed the equality (3.3) of theorem 3.1, by setting:

$$(B.1) \qquad R_h^{(N)}(F,G,X) = \widetilde{R}_h^{(N)}(F,G,X) - \widetilde{R}_h^{(N)}(G,F,X).$$

It remains to obtain an upper bound for the norm of the two above terms. One also has:

$$\widetilde{R}_h^{(N)}(F,G,X) = \left(\frac{h}{2i}\right)^N (\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}\times[0,1]} \frac{(1-\theta)^{N-1}}{(N-1)!} K_h(X,Y,Z) \Psi(X,Y,Z,\theta) dY dZ d\theta$$

where

$$K_h(X,Y,Z) = e^{-\frac{2i}{h}\sigma(Y-X,Z-X)}$$

$$\Psi(X,Y,Z,\theta) = \Big(\sigma(\nabla_1,\nabla_2)^N (F\otimes G)\Big)(Y, X+\theta(Z-X)).$$

The function K_h is invariant by the following operator:

$$L_h = \left(1 + 4\frac{|X-Y|^2}{h} + 4\frac{|X-Z|^2}{h}\right)^{-1} (1 - h\Delta_Y - h\Delta_Z)$$

Therefore, for all integers K and ℓ:

$$|\nabla^\ell \widetilde{R}_h^{(N)}(F,G,X)| \leq \left(\frac{h}{2}\right)^N (\pi h)^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}\times[0,1]} \frac{(1-\theta)^{N-1}}{(N-1)!} |\nabla^\ell ({}^tL)^K \Psi(X,Y,Z,\theta)| \; dY dZ d\theta.$$

Consequently:

$$(B.2) \qquad h^{\ell/2} |\nabla^\ell \widetilde{R}_h^{(N)}(F,G,X)| \leq C \sum_{\substack{\alpha+\beta\leq \ell+2K+2N \\ \alpha\geq N, \beta\geq N}} h^{(\alpha+\beta)/2} I_{\alpha\beta}(X,h)$$

(B.3)

$$I_{\alpha\beta}(X,h) = h^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{4n}\times[0,1]} (1-\theta)^{N-1} \left(1 + \frac{|X-Y|+|X-Z|}{\sqrt{h}}\right)^{-2K} |\nabla^\alpha F(Y)| |\nabla^\beta G(X+\theta(Z-X))| dY dZ d\theta. \blacksquare$$

End of the proof of theorem 3.1. We integrate the above equality (B.3) with respect to X, by making the change of variables:

$$X = (1-\theta)^{-1} \, (\widetilde{X} - \theta \widetilde{Z}) \qquad\qquad Y = \widetilde{Y} \qquad\qquad Z = \widetilde{Z}.$$

We obtain :

$$\|I_{\alpha\beta}(.,h)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq ...$$

$$... \leq C h^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{6n}\times[0,1]} (1-\theta)^{N-2n-1} \left(1 + \frac{|X-Y|+|X-Z|}{\sqrt{h}}\right)^{-2K} |\nabla^\alpha F(Y)| \; |\nabla^\beta G(X)| \; dX dY dY dZ d\theta.$$

If one has $N \geq 2n+1$ and if one chooses $K = 2n+1$, we deduce, by using the Schur lemma, that:

$$\| I_{\alpha\beta}(.,h) \|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C \| \nabla^\alpha F \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \ \| \nabla^\beta G \|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}.$$

Adding these inequalities, we obtain:

$$h^{\ell/2} | \nabla^\ell R_h^{(N,1)}(F,G,X) | \leq C \sum_{\substack{\alpha+\beta \leq \ell+2K+2N \\ \alpha \geq N, \beta \geq N}} h^{(\alpha+\beta)/2} \| \nabla^\alpha F \|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \ \| \nabla^\beta G \|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}.$$

By similarly proceeding for $\widetilde{R}_h^{(N)}(G,F,.)$, we arrive at the upper bound (3.5) of theorem 3.1. Point (3.6) is then deduced by proposition 2.1.

End of the proof of theorem3.2. If one chooses $K = 2n+1$, it follows from (B.3) that

$$\| I_{\alpha\beta}(.,h) \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq C \| \nabla^\alpha F \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \ \| \nabla^\beta G \|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}.$$

By reporting in (B.2), then in (B.1), we obtain the majorization (3.7) of theorem 3.2.

□

References

[AN1] Z. Ammari, F. Nier, *Mean field limit for bosons and infinite dimensional phase space analysis*, Ann. Henri Poincaré, **9** (2008) 8, 1503-1574.

[AN2] Z. Ammari, F. Nier, *Mean field limit for bosons and propagation of Wigner measures*, J. Math. Phys, **50** (2009), 4, 042107.

[BGGM] C. Bardos, F. Golse, A.D. Gottlieb, N.J. Mauser, *Mean field dynamics of fermions and the time-dependent Hartree-Fock equation*, J. Math. Pures Appl, 9, **82** (2003), 6, 665-683.

[B] R. Beals, *Characterization of pseudo-differential operators and applications*, Duke Math. J.,**44** (1977),1, 45-57.

[BR] A. Bouzouina, D. Robert, *Uniform semiclassical estimates for the propagation of quantum observables,* Duke Math. J, **11**, 2 (2002), 223-252.

[BdPF1] A. Bove, G. da Prato, G. Fano, *An existence proof for the Hartree-Fock time-dependent problem with bounded two-body interaction*, Comm. Math. Phys, **37** (1974), 183-191.

[BdPF2] A. Bove, G. da Prato, G. Fano, *On the Hartree-Fock time-dependent Problem,* Comm. Math. Phys, **49** (1976) 25-33.

[BH] W. Braun, K. Hepp, *The Vlasov dynamics and its fluctuations in the $1/N$ limit of interacting classical particles,* Comm. Math. Phys, **56** (1977), 101-120.

[CV] A.-P.Calderòn, R. Vaillancourt, *A class of bounded pseudo-differential operators*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., **69** (1972), 1185-1187.

[CR1] M. Combescure, D. Robert, *Semiclassical spreading of quantum wave packets and applications near unstable fixed points of the classical flow,* Asymptotic Anal, **14** (1997) 377-404.

[CF] A. Cordoba, C. Fefferman, *Wave packets and Fourier Integral operators,* Comm. in P.D.E, 3 (**11**) (1978), 979-1005.

[DLERS] A. Domps, P. L'Eplattenier, P.G. Reinhard, E. Suraud, *The Vlasov equation for Coulomb systems and the Husimi picture,* Annalen der Physik, **6** (1997), 455-467.

[ES] L. Erdös, B. Schlein, *Quantum dynamics with mean field interactions: a new approach*, J. Stat. Phys, **134**, (2009), 3, 1171-1210.

[F] G.B. Folland, *Harmonic analysis in phase space*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, **122**. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1989.

[FKS] J. Fröhlich, A. Knowles, S. Schwarz, *On the mean-field limit of bosons with Coulomb two-body interaction*, Comm. Math. Phys, **288** (2009), 3, 1023-1059.

[GMP] S. Graffi, A. Martinez, M. Pulvirenti, *Mean field approximation of quantum systems and classical limit*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci, **13** (2003), 1, 59-73.

[H]L. Hörmander, *The analysis of* linear partial differential operators. III. Pseudo-differential operators. Springer, 1985.

[L1] N. Lerner, *Some facts about the Wick calculus,* in *Pseudodifferential Operators,* 135-174, Lecture Notes in Math. 1949, Springer, Berlin 2008.

[P] F. Pezzotti, *Mean-field limit and semiclassical approximation for quantum particle systems.* Rend. Math. Appl. **7**, 29, (2009), 3-4, 223-340.

[PP] F. Pezzotti, M. Pulvirenti, *Mean-field limit and semiclassical expansion of a quantum particle system.* Ann. Henri Poincaré, **10** (2009), 1, 145-187.

[RS] M. Reed, B. Simon, *Fourier alnalysis, self-adjointness*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1975.

[R1] D. Robert, *Autour de l'approximation semiclassique*, Progress in Mathematics, **68**, Birkhuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1987.

[R2] D. Robert, *Propagation of coherent states in quantum mechanics and applications,* Partial differential equations and applications, 181252, Smin. Congr, 15, SMF, Paris, 2007.

[R] C. Rondeaux, *Classes de Schatten d'opérateurs pseudo-différentiels,* Ann. E.N.S, **17**, 1, (1984), 67-81.

[S] R. Schubert, *Semiclassical localization in phase space*, PhD thesis, Ulm, 2001.

[Sp] H. Spohn, *Kinetic equations from Hamiltonian dynamics*, Rev. Mod. Phys, **52** (1980), 3, 569-615.

[U1] A. Unterberger, *Oscillateur harmonique et opérateurs pseudo-différentiels*, Ann. Inst. Fourier,XXXIX, 3, 1979.

[U2] A. Unterberger, *Les opérateurs métadifférentiels*, Lecure Notes in Physics **126**, 205-241 (1980).

laurent.amour@univ-reims.fr

khodja@univ-reims.fr

jean.nourrigat@univ-reims.fr